

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Sr.No.118

CRWP No.8018 of 2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 31.08.2022

Amanpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Tapish Kumar Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-W No.1144 of 2022

This application has been moved on behalf of the applicants-
-petitioners for seeking permission to place the amended Memo of Parties in
the main petition bearing ***CRWP No.8018 of 2022*** on the record, while
averring that due to typographical error, the name of the father of petitioner
No.2 has wrongly been spelled as Pushpinder Singh instead of Pushwinder
Singh, in the Memo of Parties filed along-with the said petition.

Notice in the application.

Mr. Arun Gupta, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab,
who has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in
pursuance of the copies of the instant application as well as of the main
petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance, accepts the
notice on behalf of the said respondents and he submits that he has no
objection in allowing this application.

Keeping in view the above-said fact as well as the reasons as
mentioned in the application and also the fact that in the vernacular version

.....

of Aadhar Card of petitioner No.2, i.e Annexure P-2, the name of his father has been mentioned as Pushwinder Singh, the present application is allowed and the amended Memo of Parties, as submitted along-with this application, is taken on the record.

CRWP No.8018 of 2022

By way of the instant petition, both the petitioners seek the indulgence of this Court for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7 because they (petitioners) are living in relationship. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation (Annexure P-3) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners restricts his prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to look into and take appropriate action on the said representation of the petitioners, i.e. Annexure P-3.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

However, it is worth-while to mention here that in Para No.2 of the petition, it has categorically been averred that the marriage of petitioner No.1 had been solemnized with respondent No.4 and two sons have also born out of this wedlock.

Be that as it may, keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right as enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India which ensures the protection of life and liberty to the citizens as well as the above-

.....

discussed limited prayer as made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the legality and validity of the relationship between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, S.A.S. Nagar, is hereby directed to look into the afore-said representation (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve any protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall not be construed to be a shield to the petitioners against any action/proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against them by any competent authority/person on account of their above-said relationship and permissible under the relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

31.08.2022	(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
neetu	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No